

**Interagency Land Tenure Committee Meeting Notes**  
**5/8/06**

**Present:**

Inyo County: Ted Williams, Tanda Gretz  
Mono County: Haven Kiers, Nate Greenberg  
Inyo Nat Forest: Garry Oye  
BLM: Steve Nelson, Bill Dunkelberger

**The purpose of the meeting was to continue working on production of land ownership adjustment opportunity maps for Mono and northern Inyo counties, depicting current land ownership and all agency parcels potentially available for disposal. The purpose of the maps and accompanying database is to share information with agencies and public as a tool to consider potential land adjustment actions. An underlying goal of this collaborative effort is to enhance opportunities to identify mutually beneficial, community supported land adjustment actions that should lead to better land use decisions.**

The City of Bishop and LADWP were unable to send representatives today. Bill announced that our guest speaker, Charlie Knox could not attend today since he just started a new planning job in the Bay Area.

Group briefly reviewed existing disposal parcel data and identified remaining needs for map/database. Inyo County is still identifying parcels potentially available for disposal. The Board of Supervisors has agendized a discussion and possible approval of potential parcels on May 16. All other agencies have provided disposal parcel information.

Group reviewed the land ownership adjustment goals and constraints statements. Most agencies identified the need to refine these. Consensus was to use the following categories: (Land Ownership Adjustment) Mission, Needs, Constraints, Miscellaneous, and Contact Info, which was added. Please revise and email final approved copy to Steve Nelson prior to next meeting. (Draft attached below.) This information will provide database users with critical background information on each agency's, unique land ownership adjustment programs.

Group discussed next steps in terms of disseminating the database information. The idea of a stand-alone, dedicated website to host the database was suggested. This has merit but may be cost prohibitive. Mono County and BLM may be willing to host the database. All agencies agreed to at least post a link to the database on their websites. This topic will be further addressed at the next meeting.

The need for an introductory, explanatory document that provides an overview of the database and its purpose was discussed. Everyone agreed that such a document was needed and should be a mandatory, introductory screen before accessing the database. Bill agreed to draft the document, largely from the purpose statement above and circulate for review.

Group discussed its progress. All agreed that while the process of assembling the database was progressing slower than anticipated, it is important to ensure that the database represents a complete, accurate product before disseminating to the public. Bill was unable to meet with the "No Name Committee" on April 14. This group of private landowners and non-agency affiliated citizens is concurrently studying land adjustment issues and recently adopted a name for themselves: CAL-EX (Citizens Advocating Land Exchanges.) Bill and Steve will be updating them on land ownership adjustment opportunity database progress on May 18 in Big Pine.

**The next land tenure committee meeting was tentatively scheduled for June 22, 2-4 PM at the FS/BLM office in Bishop. *If Inyo County is able to finalize its parcel data on May 16, the subcommittee will meet on June 1 instead. Ted will let Bill know of the county's progress ASAP***

***so the group can determine via email if the June 1 meeting is warranted.*** The purpose of this meeting will include finalizing database, determining methods and venues for distribution, assigning final work tasks, and further meetings.

*(The work products of this committee and all information from all agencies are strictly preliminary inventory data for information sharing purposes only. Map and database products are not to be construed as official planning documents or decision documents.)*

## Agency/Organization Land Tenure Mission, Land Tenure Needs, Constraints

Party	Mission	Needs	Constraints	Miscellaneous	Contact Information
<b>BLM</b>	Dispose difficult, unmgable, low res value lands. Acquire mgble, hi res value lands. Provide land for cmtly purposes/expansion.	Increase efficiency of land mgmt.	Disposal of hi value lands, WSAs, ACECs, watershed wdlis (Cong/EO). Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.	Will only acquire from willing sellers only. Consider Ridgecrest FO BLM lands as an opp to improve the data base pool.	
<b>Inyo NF</b>	Interested in acquiring inholdings inside USFS lands. Multiple hi res value areas – prioritized. Desires to retain USFS lands/admin sites in cmties for employee housing.	Desires employees living in cmties on USFS admin sites. Ongoing land tenure process in Mono Cty/Mmth Lks.	\$\$\$\$. No complex land planning process. Nature of land tenure = difficult/complex. Counter to current administration view. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.	Community needs can only be addressed by tenure if cmtly is within the USFS boundary.	
<b>Mono Cty</b>	Contain developments in/around cmties. Development directed by gen'l plan.	Seeks orderly cmtly expansion with decision making at cmtly level. Policies promoting agricultural lands, scenic areas, open space character = zoning policies.	Lack of infrastructure. Ltd land base. \$\$\$\$ Lengthy process. Willing sellers. Each cmtly has individual constraints because of unique character. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.		
<b>LADWP</b>	Watershed protection to improve water quality/quantity.	Acquire lands and access around DWP facilities. Need access for ops and maintenance. Divest excess lands in and around towns. Divest/acquisitions of lands dependent on resource values.	Cannot sell water rts. Cannot sell ranches. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc. Priority for disposal based on compliance with 75 acres as per water agreement.		

<b>Party</b>	<b>Mission</b>	<b>Needs</b>	<b>Constraints</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
<b>Inyo Cty</b>	Contain developments in/around cmties. Development directed by gen'l plan. Encourage development around existing cmties. Work with BLM/DWP re: land tenure.	Information of land tenure possibilities thru agencies, etc.	No net loss of pvt acreage. No mechanism to coordinate land trades. No 3 way land trade mechanism process. How to deal with new developments. DWP/IC water agreement ties up lands. Information regarding agency lands not readily available. Agencies may be competing for the same land. Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc.		
<b>City of Bishop</b>	Provide suitable housing , infrastructure, and employment for cmty.	Acquisition for growth. Wants to provide housing for various income groups from low to high, including senior citizens.	Env. Constraints --- res value issues i.e. plants, cultural, etc. City bdies are confined. Gets the last scraps/rations -- -have to wait until other agencies (cty, etc) act before they get anything.		